

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending as of the action mailed on 7 March 2007.

Claims 1, 13, 16 and 18 are being amended, no claims are being canceled and no new claims are being added. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 13, 16 and 18 may be found within the applicant's specification at least at page 4, lines 1-20.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the action are requested in light of the forgoing amendments and the following remarks.

Oath/Declaration

The examiner noted that the citizenship for the inventor Joerg Singler was not identified on the Declaration. In response, the applicant notes that Joerg Singler is of German citizenship. The applicant is in the process of preparing a corrected declaration to be submitted under separate cover.

Specification

The examiner objected to the specification for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, the examiner notes that the specification does not disclose the criteria for determining the greatest set of multiple client capabilities. To expedite prosecution, and without prejudice, claim 7 has been amended to overcome the objection, as noted above.

Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is therefore respectfully requested.

Section 101 Rejections

The examiner has rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. To expedite prosecution, and without prejudice, claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as noted above. Claims 2-12 depend from claim 1. As claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §

101, by virtue of their dependency on claim 1, the rejection of dependent claims 2-12 is now also overcome.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is therefore respectfully requested.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13, 14 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,003,773 (“Hoenning”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,300,947 (“Kanevsky”).

Claims 8, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Hoenning in view of Kanevsky, in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. 2001/0047383 A1 (“Dutta”).

Claims 1, 13, 16 and 18

To expedite prosecution and without prejudice, claims 1, 13, 16 and 18 have been amended to recite, “use [of] the data elements to select an adapter at the client abstraction layer [on the server] to convert communication between an application running on the server and one or more client programs, the adapter being used by the client abstraction layer as an intermediary, the adapter hiding client-specific behavior from the application running on the server.”

Neither Hoennig or Kanevsky, alone or in combination, teach “an adapter being used by the client abstraction layer as an intermediary, the adapter hiding client-specific behavior from the application running on the server”. Hoennig teaches “when [a] user object demands an interface that is not offered by [a] service object in an access request, [the] service object dynamically obtains an interface adapter from [the] adapter manager that allows [the] user object and service object to communicate,” (Hoennig – Col. 6, lines 21-25). Thus, in order for the server to determine that it does not offer the client-requested interface and to obtain the interface adapter from the adapter manager, Hoennig specifically requires that the application running on the server is aware of the client-specific behavior. Thus, the client-specific behavior is not hidden from the application running on the server.

In Hoennig, the adapter manager does provide the interface adapter; however, the adapter manager is doing so in response to the server request. The adapter manager is not acting as an intermediary between the client and the application running on the server. The adapter manager is therefore not hiding client-specific behavior from the application running on the server.

Kanevsky also does not provide a teaching directed to “an adapter being used by the client abstraction layer as an intermediary, the adapter hiding client-specific behavior from the application running on the server.” Thus, neither Hoennig or Kanevsky, alone or in combination teach each and every element of amended claims 1, 13, 16 and 18, as noted above.

For at least these reasons, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 13, 16 and 18 be withdrawn.

Remaining Claims

The remaining claims depend from or correspond to independent claims 1, 13, 16 and 18, and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Applicant : Joerg Singler et al.
Serial No. : 10/658,683
Filed : September 8, 2003
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 13913-117001 / 2003P00254 US

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4 June 2007

/Arrienne M. Lezak/

Arrienne M. Lezak

Reg. No. 51,943

Customer No. 32864

Fish & Richardson P.C.

Telephone: (650) 839-5070

Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50405867.doc